



Magnuson Park
Wetland, Habitat and Athletic Field Development Project
PROJECT ADVISORY TEAM MEETING
Tuesday, August 16 2005 4:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.
Magnuson Park Building #30 Conference Room

Meeting Summary

1. Parks Staff Project Manager, Jon Jainga welcomes everyone to the meeting.
2. Community comments: No public comments
3. Site Design Layout – continues The Berger Partnership with member's assignments.

Guy reviewed the development of southern portion of phase two, and in particular, the idea of trying to capture more water by creating Wetlands between fields 6 & 7 and south of field 9. To do this field 7 (Future) will be pushed south and field 6 pushed north from the master plan Locations to allow adequate space. The PAT unanimously supported this Proposal.

Guy reviewed the opportunity to focus wetland development in the natural area between fields 1-5, based on the water supply provided by new field construction. A concern was voiced that wetlands here might damage the existing arbutus, but the design team noted that the new Wetlands would be both away from and lower than those trees, so an impact is not expected, and they grow in wetland conditions now. The PAT unanimously supported this proposal.

Guy noted that with the addition of these wetlands to the scope, the project still ahead to stay to its existing budget unless other funding is added, possibly by fundraising /grant writing by wetland advocates and organizations. So expansion of scope in these areas may mean reductions in others, notably the NE Phase two line (north of the Promontory ponds) where the phase line has always been considered relatively arbitrary until the design was further developed.

Lynn requested funding of wetlands and fields be equal in phase 2.

Guy again noted that they would not be equal on a dollar for dollar basis, as they were not funded equally on a dollar for dollar basis, but rather, there is a "wetland Budget" and a "field Budget" that already exist and are not within the control of the project team. However, when the construction documents are ultimately assembled for bidding, we will have to determine what work comes from which budgets, and it is during this time that it is most appropriate to debate the fields vs. wetlands. Guy noted there will inevitably be some debate about dividing up budgets, as the project is cohesive, with parts integral to both fields and wetland/habitat. (Such as earthmoving, trails, signage, etc.).

Matt presented his proposal regarding the water flow and recommendations. Matt stated the Parks need to give clear directions to both groups and consultants regarding user groups, i.e., "Men's Baseball". City can't maintain fields they have right now, why build them.

Guy noted that with Phase 2, we are trying to get a completed project, so in case the project receives no more money, the project is complete. Guy also noted that the south end is an eyesore; we just need to clean it up.

Lynn asked a question regarding the water supply for the wetland and if it is only rainfall that drives and supplies the Wetland? Lynn also asked about the north end fields and asked where the drainage water is coming from?

Tom stated; If pie in the sky (regarding funds) Phase 3, where will the other fields be located?

Dyanne noted; the water needs to be pretreated before it goes into the rice fields.

Lynn asked how sports meadow will be treated.

Dyanne stated; the water will be treated by the existing treatment ditch which has existed since 1974. Existing wetlands is driven by rain water. Future will be driven by rain water as well and collection from fields and parking lots. No infiltration.

Lynn presented her vision proposal for the wetland buffer. It includes, islands, nesting areas, plant removal and plant other native plants.

Dyanne noted that open meadows are hard to maintain.

Lynn noted; does not think that community needs to know the reason why meadow will not work.

Bob mentioned that there is a signage plan that is developed and approved. Wants to know where it is and wants us to ask Eric about the signage.

Lynn noted; great time to removal parking lot at the tennis court.

Tom noted; not worst off on parking demand.

Guy; be careful of thinking in timing in regards to the interior parking lot.

Dyanne gave an up date regarding the proposed wetland violation letter and the Army Corps of Engineers. Mentioned that the PPP lawsuit may be void as a result.

Dyanne noted that we have a 2 to 1 ratio regarding the wetland mitigations.

Guy noted; he was seeing support and approval from the PAT regarding the design.

Next Meeting September 20, 2005

Additional Information is Available:

- <http://www.seattle.gov/parks/proparks/projects/spmpFields.htm>
- <http://www.seattle.gov/parks/proparks/projects/SPMPWetlands.htm>
- Jon Jainga, Seattle Parks Project Manager (206) 684-7054; jon.jainga@seattle.gov